

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Joseph D. Paschal,

Plaintiff,

v.

J. Reuben Long Detention Center,

Defendant.  

---

Civil Action No. 2:21-3135-BHH

**OPINION AND ORDER**

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“Report”) of United States Magistrate Judge Mary Gordon Baker, which was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. §636(b) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2) for the District of South Carolina. On December 14, 2021, the Magistrate Judge issued her Report recommending that this case be dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process as Plaintiff has failed to name a proper defendant and the Complaint does not contain sufficient factual allegations to raise a plausible claim under the Fourteenth Amendment. (ECF No. 11.)

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this Court. See *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The Court may also receive further evidence or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *Id.* The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made.

Plaintiff filed no objections and the time for doing so expired on January 1, 2022. (See *id.* (noting objections were due by December 29, 2021, with an additional three

days to be added if served by mail).) In the absence of objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report, this Court is not required to provide an explanation for adopting the recommendation. See *Camby v. Davis*, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). Rather, "in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'" *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).

Here, because no objections have been filed, the Court has reviewed the Magistrate Judge's findings and recommendations for clear error. Finding none, the Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge that Plaintiff has failed to name a proper defendant and the Complaint does not contain sufficient factual allegations to raise a plausible claim under the Fourteenth Amendment. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation is adopted and incorporated herein by reference and this action is DISMISSED *without prejudice* and without issuance and service of process.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

/s/Bruce Howe Hendricks  
United States District Judge

January 18, 2022  
Greenville, South Carolina

\*\*\*\*\*

#### **NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The parties are hereby notified that any right to appeal this Order is governed by Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.